

SEP 27 2007

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NADENE M. SAMMANN, individually;
et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

ESTATE OF ELIZABETH SAMMANN;
et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Nos. 06-35248
06-35534

D.C. No. CV-05-00929-RSL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 24, 2007**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, Nadene and Marguerite Sammann appeal pro

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

se from the district court's order dismissing for failure to comply with court orders their action to set aside alleged fraudulent conveyances of federal oil and gas leases. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion when it dismissed the case for failure to comply with court orders after weighing the relevant five factors. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 641-44 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that district court's dismissal for failure to comply with a court order is reviewed for an abuse of discretion; setting forth five factors to be considered).

The district court did not abuse its discretion when it denied the motion to amend the judgment because Appellants did not identify any new evidence, change in law, clear error, or manifest injustice. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (stating that district court's denial of a motion to amend the judgment is reviewed for an abuse of discretion; setting forth requirements for reconsideration).

Appellants' remaining contentions are not persuasive.

Appellants' request for judicial notice is denied. Appellants' motion for reconsideration of the Court's January 7, 2007 order denying their motion to file a corrected replacement opening brief is denied. Appellants' request for a stay of the due date for their optional reply brief is denied as moot.

AFFIRMED.